APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,141	01/03/2002	Radhika Aggarwal	RSW920010112US1 (007)	2419

46320   7590   07/25/2008
CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP
STEVEN M. GREENBERG
950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE
SUITE 3020
BOCA RATON, FL 33487

EXAMINER
HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 April 2008</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 4/28/08 to application

filed on 01/03/2002.

2.   Claim 1 is amended. Claims 6-10 are canceled.

3.   Claims 1-5 are pending in the case. Claim 1 is independent claims.

4.   All rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by the

affidavit filed on 12/21/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35
U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the
time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the
obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly
owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35
U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6.   **Claims 1- 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Radtke **et al., US 2002/0113810 A1, filed 12/22/2000,** Hartman **, US 6,615,226 B1, filed**

09/1997, Jeffries **et al., US 6,094,529, filed 12/1996 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS**

filed 01/03/2002, and "Instant HTML", Homer **et al., copyright 1997, pages 88-101.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Radtke teaches the steps of:

- detecting in a form-based submit, at least one validation error based upon a value provided through an input-element in a markup specified form (Radtke, [0019]-[0022]; user enters data to fields of an internet web page form and submits the form, validating entered data in submitted form to detect invalid data);

- selecting error text corresponding to said validation error and inserting said selected error text approximate to the data field (Radtke, page 2, TABLE 1; [0017], [0019]-[0022], appropriate error text message among multiple error text message is provided according to the error type); and

- serving said markup specified form in a response to said form-based submit (Radtke, [0022]).

Upton does not explicitly disclose inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element and said row having a background color which differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said inserted row; inserting an anchor tag in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element; and in a response to said form-based submit, said response referring said anchor tag.

Hartman teaches inserting a row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element (Hartman, col.9, lines 55-59; displaying error message on the line below to the data entry field that contains the error).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman and Radtke to provide the error message in different positions proximate to the error input element to inform the user of error, since below or/and next is one form of proximate position.

Jeffries teaches error message is highlighted, such as by underlining, changing the
background color to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined Jeffries' visual indicator in error message into Radtke's
error message in web page form to insert error text message having a background color which
differs from other colors which a visible in proximity to said insert error text, since this would
have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form. It is
also noted that highlighting error data or error text field in a web page form as a visual indicator
for the user re-entries the data was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.

Homer teaches including an anchor within a page so that, when we load the page, that
part of the document is automatically scrolled into view (Homer, page 88, "Anchors Within A
Page" section; placing the anchor tag with name "dalmation" in section Dalmatians to directly
scroll to that section when the page dog.html is loaded).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Radtke's redisplay form to insert
an anchor tag in the web page form in a position which is proximate to said input element, since
this would have allowed when the user submit the web page form, error part of the web page
form is automatically scrolled into view Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a correct
data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is directly
provided.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Radtke teaches inserting an error marker adjacent to said input-element (Radtke, [0017]). However, Radtke does not explicitly disclose inserting an error image adjacent to said input-element.

Jeffries teaches insert a glyph near highlighting text error message to provide a visual indicator (Jeffries, col.3, lines 33-36 and col.5, lines 24-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Jeffries' glyph visual indicator in error message into Radtke's error message in html form to insert a image/glyph near the error text message, since this would have provided a visual indicator for the user to focus on erroneous field in the html form.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Radtke, Jefferies, Hartman and Homer teaches display error message proximate to said input element (error field) as explained above. However, Upton does not explicitly disclose determining whether said markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element and if it is determined that said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status

Hartman teaches a markup specified form contained multiple views, one of said multiple view containing said input-element (error field) (Hartman, col.9, lines 38-59).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hartman's teaching and Radtke's teaching to includes the steps of determining said markup specified form contains multiple views, identifying said one of said multiple views and setting said identified one of said multiple views to a visible status, since

this would have allowed error message to be displayed proximity to error field in both simple

or/and complex form which contains multiple view to inform error for the user re-entries, since

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, refer to claim 1, the limitation of

"inserting an error message row in said markup specified form in a position which is proximate

to but below said input element, said error message row having a background color which differs

from other colors which are visible in proximity to said inserted row" is included. The rationale

is incorporated herein.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4. Refer to the rationale relied to reject

claim 1, Radtke, Jefferies, Hartman and Homer teach inserting an anchor tag in said markup

specified form in a position which is proximate to said input element. Homer also teaches the

anchor tag place <u>before</u> the section to be automatically displayed (Homer, page 97, "Using

Anchors in Your Pages" section).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Homer's teaching into Radtke's redisplay form to insert

an anchor tag in the html form in a position which is proximate but before to said input element,

since placing the anchor tag before the error section would have allowed the error part of the web

page form is automatically scrolled into view as Homer's disclosed above for the user enter a

correct data as. This would have facilitated the user to re-enter the data when the error field is

directly provided.

Response to Arguments

Applicants argue that the Declaration filed on 12/21/04 has established actual reduction to practice of claimed invention prior to the filing date of Upton.

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, pages 3-6, filed on 4/28/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-5 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Declaration filed on 12/21/04 is sufficient overcome the Upton reference and the effective date is back to 12/26/2000 that is the last modified exhihibit A filed with the Declaration on 12/21/04. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Radtke, Jefferies, Hartman and Homer as explained in the rejection above.

Applicants argue that the Declaration filed on 12/05/05 has established constructive reduction to practice of claimed invention prior to the filling date of Upton, since the reasonable diligence is provided that meet the requirement.

This is not persuasive. Based on applicants' submitted evidence, there is time gaps of lacking activity and explanation, that is from the filing date of Upton reference 10/18/01 to Final Draft 10/29/01 and from the Final Draft 10/29/01 to Declaration signed instant application 11/8/01. It is also appears that applicants do not explain how the provided exhibit A (Attorney Docket) indicating "the application was taken up in the ordinary course of ongoing work in roughly chronological order from when the application was received". Therefore, the declaration filed on 12/05/05 fails to provide activities and particular facts associated with time that applicants are relying on to show completion without unexplained time gaps.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to
have relevancy to the claimed invention.

        Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this
office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to THU V. HUYNH whose telephone number is (571)272-4126.
The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would
like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated
information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

                                                        /Thu Huynh/
                                                        Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
                                                        July 21, 2008